Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	**Application No.** 10/590,260	**Applicant(s)** JOHANSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Chun-Kuan Lee	**Art Unit** 2181	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: _____.
   Claim(s) objected to: _____.
   Claim(s) rejected: _____.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Please see Continuation Sheet below.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Alford W. Kindred/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2181

As per applicant's amendments to independent claim 1, the examiner will not enter the amendments because the "end termination" claimed limitation was originally in a disjunctive statement, but current amendments changed the "end termination" claimed limitation to be in a conjunctive statement; wherein such amendments do not place the application in better form for appeal or simplify the issues for appeal.

In response to applicant's arguments (on pages 6-7) with regard to the amended independent claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that the combination of references does not teach the claimed limitation "end termination" because the combination of references does not teach/suggest a termination hub which is connected to the last cable section in the cable bus and a termination is used to electrically terminate the cable bus; applicant's arguments have fully been considered, but are not found to be persuasive.

Please note that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a termination hub which is connected to the last cable section in the cable bus and a termination is used to electrically terminate the cable bus) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's arguments (on pages 7-9) with regard to the independent claim 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that the combination of references does not teach/suggest the claimed feature "a junction" because Sitte's Figure 11, reference 220, 230, 710 and 712 are a microprocessor, a CAN protocol chip, a ROM and a RAM, and cannot be consider to be the junction because they do not form part of a cable unit; applicant's arguments have fully been considered, but are not found to be persuasive.

The examiner respectfully disagrees, because "junction" is understood and defined (i.e. defied by Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition; p. 298) as "any point at which two or more electrical components are connected"; therefore, Sitte's Figure 11, reference 220, 230, 710 and 712 is the point at which two electrical components (e.g. Fig. 11, ref. 722, 724, 702 and cable 10 of Fig. 1) are connected; wherein, Sitte's Figure 11, reference 220, 230, 710 and 712 is comprised in the cable unit as Sitte's Figure 11, reference 220, 230, 710 and 712 is part of the interconnection between the sensors (Fig. 1, ref. 722, 724, 702) and the cable.

In response to applicant's arguments (on pages 7-9) with regard to the independent claim 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that the combination of references does not teach/suggest the claimed feature "at least two control signal supply cable between the junction and the electrical connector" because Sitte's wiring comprise one control signal return wire, one control signal supply cable and two power wires; applicant's arguments have fully been considered, but are not found to be persuasive.

Please note that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The examiner respectfully disagrees, as the examiner relied on the references as following: Sitte teaches a cable unit comprises a junction (Fig. 1, ref. 20 and Fig. 11, ref. 220, 230, 710, 712), at least one electrical connector (e.g. electrical connector located between the junction (Fig. 11, ref. 220, 230, 710, 712) and the sensors Fig. 11, ref. 702, 720)) and at least two control signals supplied between said junction and said electrical connector (e.g. control signal supply between the junction and the sensor element 702 of Fig. 11) (Fig. 1; Fig. 11; col. 4, ll. 39-45; col. 7, l. 8 to col. 8, l. 51 and col. 15, l. 18 to col. 17, l. 49), wherein the actuators would may be utilized in place of the sensors for receiving the supplied control signals.

Longsdorf teaches at least a cable connected to a connector (e.g. connector of a sensor) that are electronically jointed at the connector (Fig. 1-2; col. 3, l. 29 to col. 4, l. 50 and col. 5, ll. 24-30), in combination with Sitte's above teaching, the at least two control signal further includes at least two control signal supply cables that are electronically jointed at the connector, wherein the joining at the connector is implemented via a loop current (i.e. current loop).

More specifically, by utilizing the actuators (e.g. as taught by AAPA) in place of the sensors for receiving the supplied control signals, the wiring utilized by the junction to forward the control signals to the actuators corresponds to the at least two control signal supply cables.

In response to applicant's arguments (on pages 9-10) with regard to the independent claim 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that the combination of references does not teach/suggest "electrically joined" because the term is interpreted as "directly electrically connected"; applicant arguments have fully been considered, but are not found to be persuasive.

Please note that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a directly electrically connected) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's arguments (on page 10) with regard to the independent claim 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that the combination of references does not teach/suggest the claimed feature of two control signal return cables in addition to two control signal supply cables; applicant's arguments have fully been considered, but are not found to be persuasive.

The examiner respectfully disagrees, as the examiner relied on the references as following: Sitte teaches a cable unit comprises a junction (Fig. 1, ref. 20 and Fig. 11, ref. 220, 230, 710, 712), at least one electrical connector (e.g. electrical connector located between the junction (Fig. 11, ref. 220, 230, 710, 712) and the sensors Fig. 11, ref. 702, 720)) and at least two control signals supplied between said junction and said electrical connector (e.g. control signal supply between the junction and the sensor element 702 of Fig. 11) (Fig. 1; Fig. 11; col. 4, ll. 39-45; col. 7, l. 8 to col. 8, l. 51 and col. 15, l. 18 to col. 17, l. 49), wherein the actuators would may be utilized in place of the sensors for receiving the supplied control signals.

Longsdorf teaches at least a cable connected to a connector (e.g. connector of a sensor) that are electronically jointed at the connector (Fig. 1-2; col. 3, l. 29 to col. 4, l. 50 and col. 5, ll. 24-30), in combination with Sitte's above teaching, the at least two control signal further includes at least two control signal supply cables that are electronically jointed at the connector, wherein the joining at the connector is implemented via a loop current (i.e. current loop).

More specifically, the sensors provide the corresponding control signals over the at least two control signal return cables to the junction; furthermore, as explained above, by utilizing the actuators (e.g. as taught by AAPA) in place of the sensors for receiving the supplied control signals, the wiring utilized by the junction to forward the control signals to the actuators corresponds to the at least two control signal supply cables. In summary, the combination of the references (i.e. AAPA, Sitte and Longsdorf) teaches/suggests the

junction (i.e. comprised in the cable unite as explained above) is coupled to the actuators (e.g. at least two actuators) and supplies the control signals over the corresponding at least two control signal supply cables to the actuators, and is coupled to the sensors (e.g. at least two sensors) and receives the control signals over the corresponding at least two control signal return cables from the sensors.

In response to applicant's arguments (on pages 10-11) with regard to the independent claim 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that the combination of references does not teach/suggest the claimed feature of a current loop; applicant's arguments have fully been considered, but are not found to be persuasive.

The examiner respectfully disagrees, as Longsdorf teaches a control system comprising at least a cable connected to a connector (e.g. connector of a sensor) that are electronically jointed at the connector (e.g. wherein the joining at the connector is implemented via a loop current (i.e. current loop)) (Fig. 1-2; col. 3, l. 29 to col. 4, l. 50 and col. 5, ll. 24-30).

In responding to all applicant's arguments above, the examiner will maintain his position and the current rejection of record.